IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

ABBOTT CARDIOVASCULAR SYSTEMS INC. and ABBOTT LABORATORIES INC.,)
Plaintiffs,)
V.) C. A. No. 98-80 (SLR) (Consolidated with C.A. No. 98-314
MEDTRONIC VASCULAR, INC. and MEDTRONIC USA, INC.,) (SLR) and C.A. No. 98-316 (SLR))
Defendants.)))

ABBOTT'S OPPOSITION TO MEDTRONIC'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SURREPLY TO ABBOTT'S MOTION TO LIFT STAY OF PROCEEDINGS ON ABBOTT'S MOTION FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION AS TO MEDTRONIC'S ENDEAVOR

Plaintiffs Abbott Cardiovascular Systems Inc. and Abbott Laboratories Inc. (collectively "Abbott") respectfully oppose Medtronic's Motion for Leave to File Surreply to Abbott's Motion to Lift Stay of Proceedings on Abbott's Motion for Permanent Injunction as to Medtronic's Endeavor. (D.I. 832.) Medtronic's proposed surreply is an improper attempt to take the last word on Abbott's motion to lift the stay of injunction proceedings as to Medtronic's Endeavor and thus should be denied.

Under the Court's Local Rules, Medtronic has no right to file a surreply. *See* Local Rule 7.1.2(b). Moreover, in this instance, there are no unusual facts or circumstances that militate in favor of permitting Medtronic to file one. Indeed, to the contrary, if Medtronic were permitted to file a surreply, it would cause unfair prejudice to Abbott.

While Medtronic contends that its surreply is necessary to address two alleged misstatements of fact in Abbott's reply brief—a contention that is totally incorrect—Medtronic's proposed surreply repeats and rehashes the same arguments that it made (or could have made) in its opposition brief. (D.I. 832.) Additionally, Medtronic's surreply belatedly raises new arguments in support of its request for more discovery and its improper equitable-estoppel defense. Furthermore, Medtronic proposes to submit well over 100 pages of new evidence as exhibits to its surreply. (*Id.*) If Medtronic were permitted to raise these new arguments and new evidence outside of the briefing schedule, Abbott would be denied adequate opportunity to address them and thus would be unfairly prejudiced. *Chambers v. Doe*, 453 F. Supp. 2d 858, 861 n.3 (D. Del. 2006) (granting motion to strike surreply where "the surreply belatedly raises arguments not raised in plaintiff's answering brief and that raising the issues outside the briefing schedule denies defendants the full opportunity to explore and address the arguments"). Accordingly, the Court should deny Medtronic's motion for leave to file a surreply.

Of Counsel:

J. Michael Jakes
Gerald F. Ivey
Michael A. Morin
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4413
(202) 408-4000

Dated: April 16, 2008

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2553)
cottrell@rlf.com
Anne Shea Gaza (#4093)
gaza@rlf.com
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER
One Rodney Square
P.O. Box 551
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 651-7509
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Abbott Cardiovascular
Systems Inc. and Abbott Laboratories Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 16, 2008, I caused to be served by hand delivery the foregoing document and electronically filed the same with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing(s) to the following:

Karen Jacobs Louden, Esquire Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell 1201 N. Market Street P.O. Box 1347 Wilmington, Delaware 19899-1347

I hereby certify that on April 16, 2008, I have sent by Federal Express the foregoing document to the following non-registered participants:

Kevin S. Rosen, Esquire Matthew Hoffman, Esquire Anthony S. Newman, Esquire Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 333 South Grand Avgneue Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197 H. Mark Ryan, Esquire Frederick S. Chung, Esquire Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP 1881 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304-1211

Anne Shea Gaza (#4093)

Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

One Rodney Square

P.O. Box 551

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 651-7700 gaza@rlf.com